



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
400 ...
Washington, DC 20530
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/626,127	07/26/2000	Robert L. Erwin	00801,0087,CPUS04	7695

7500 03/12/2003

Tom Gallegos, Sr. Director, Intellectual Property
Large Scale Biology Corporation
3333 Vaca Valley Parkway
Suite 1000
Vacaville, CA 95688

EXAMINER

RILEY, JEZIA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED 03/12/2003

70

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/626,127

Applicant(s)

GARGER ET AL.

Examiner

Jezia Riley

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 2 and 64-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 64-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/30/03 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 3-8 have been renumbered 64-69.

Response to Remarks

3. Applicants' arguments and amendments, filed on 1/30/03, have been approved and entered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions

Art Unit: 1637

applied or reiterated. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 2 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jaynes et al. (5,597,945).

Jaynes et al. discloses genetically enhanced plants, and particularly to gymnosperms, monocots and dicots genetically altered to express antifungal and

Art Unit: 1637

and/or to express polypeptides which have high proportions of limiting essential amino acids. Jaynes provides a plant having a heterologous gene encoding for an antimicrobial agent. The gene is preferably expressible, and the plant may be, for example, either a gymnosperm, a monocotyledon or a dicotyledon. The antimicrobial agent may be, for example, a lytic peptide such as attacin, lysozyme or cecropin, or an antiviral agent such as micRNA. The plants should express the heterologous gene. Generally, the gene will be operably linked to a promoter inducible in the cells of the particular plant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 2, 64, 67, 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaynes et al. (5,597,945) in view of Overbeeke et al. (5,082,778).

Jaynes et al. discloses genetically enhanced plants, and particularly to gymnosperms, monocots and dicots genetically altered to express antifungal and antibacterial peptides and/or to express polypeptides which have high proportions of limiting essential amino acids. Jaynes provides a plant having a heterologous gene encoding for an antimicrobial agent. The gene is preferably expressible, and the plant may be, for example, either a gymnosperm, a monocotyledon or a dicotyledon. The antimicrobial agent may be, for example, a lytic peptide such as attacin, lysozyme or cecropin, or an antiviral agent such as micRNA. The plants should express the heterologous gene. Generally, the gene will be operably linked to a promoter inducible in the cells of the particular plant.

Overbeeke discloses that the alpha-galactosidase gene can be expressed in plant. Plasmids were constructed capable of producing the enzyme *Nicotiana tabacum* (col. 2-4 and 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use alpha galactosidase in plants since such modification proved to be active in decreasing the galactose content of guar gum in a way of essentially identical that of the enzyme

Art Unit: 1637

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the claims was made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 1637

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 2, 64-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jaynes et al. (5,597,945).

Jaynes et al. discloses genetically enhanced plants, and particularly to gymnosperms, monocots and dicots genetically altered to express antifungal and antibacterial peptides and/or to express polypeptides which have high proportions of limiting essential amino acids. Jaynes provides a plant having a heterologous gene encoding for an antimicrobial agent. The gene is preferably expressible, and the plant may be, for example, either a gymnosperm, a monocotyledon or a dicotyledon. The antimicrobial agent may be, for example, a lytic peptide such as attacin, lysozyme or cecropin, or an antiviral agent such as micRNA. The plants should express the heterologous gene. Generally, the gene will be operably linked to a promoter inducible in the cells of the particular plant.

2. The prior art does not provide a motivation analysis substantiating the basic characterization of the

Art Unit: 1637

composition of the invention being the same as the reference, these added characteristics are presumed to be inherent in the prior art composition.

As it is pointed in *In re Fitzgerald* (205 USPQ), page 594, 2nd col., 1st full paragraph, supports the shifting of the burden of proof to the applicant that the instantly claimed invention is novel and unobvious over the prior art. Since both the prior art and the instant application prepare and use composition which appeared to be identical for the production of lysozomal enzymes in plant. The prior art therefore suggests that the composition therein disclosed are effective in such production therefore suggesting the instant application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jezia Riley whose telephone number is 703-305-6855. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 703-308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

March 5, 2003


JEZIA RILEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER